



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,722	10/24/2000	Sean Dominic Taylor	M-8835 US	3024

7590 08/27/2002

Edward C. Kwok
MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP
2001 Gateway Place, Suite 195E
San Jose, CA 95110

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUNG T

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2632

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

B

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/696,722

Applicant(s)

Sean Dominic Taylor

Examiner

Hung Nguyen T

Art Unit

2632



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 16, 2002

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-15 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (U.S. 6,124,810) in view of Jones (U.S. 5,668,543).

Regarding claim 1, Segal discloses an alert generating method [figs.1-2] comprising:

- providing to a mobile unit (108) over a wireless network (106) information (206) that identifies conditions for an alert [figs.1-4, col.9, lines 44-46];
- monitoring in the mobile unit position (108) a position of the mobile unit [col.9, line 66 to col.10, line 5];
- providing the service center (102) a signal [col.10, lines 10-27].

Segal fails to specifically disclose the alerting a designated location from the service center upon receiving the signal . However, Segal does disclose the alerting signals from the mobile

Art Unit: 2632

vehicle (108) to the dispatch center (102) for informing or determining the status of the vehicle in transit such as the vehicle has arrived or departed from a planned or unplanned stop [col.4, lines 57-62 and col.10, lines 10-27]. Furthermore, Jones discloses an advance notification system (10) could send an alert message such as "the bus will be arrive / late in five minutes" from a base station (14) to the designated location such as student homes / passenger location (36) in response to the signal from a mobile unit / pick up vehicle / bus (12) by a wireless communication which is used for communications and tracking systems that track the location , movement and destination of vehicles or individuals [figs.1,4 col.3, lines 1-34 , col.10, lines 15-24 and abstract]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Segal as taught by Jones for notifying or alerting the customer the time for goods delivery or pickup at any desired location .

Regarding claims 3-5, Segal discloses the alerting signal [figs.1-2] wherein the signal from the mobile unit via a wireless network service system / comprises telephoning and e-mail to the designated location [col.3, lines 55-64].

Regarding claims 8-11, Segal discloses the alert generating method wherein the information includes a location that identifies the conditions of the mobile communication has arrived or departed from a planned or an unplanned stop by wireless signal [fig.3, col.6, lines 14-33 and col.8, lines 8-19 and abstract].

Art Unit: 2632

Regarding claims 12-13, Segal discloses the alert generating method further comprising a selected destination for the mobile unit and an operator of the mobile unit selects the selected destination [col.4, lines 24-45].

Regarding claim 14, Segal discloses a delivery method comprising:

- creating a list of destination for delivery / load assignment [col.4, lines 26-32];
- downloading / load assignment [col.4, lines 26-32 and lines 47-56];
- selecting a destination from the list as a next destination [col.4, lines 26-47];
- monitoring distance [col.4, lines 26-62];
- generating an alert [col.10, lines 10-27];
- receiving the alert at the service center [col.10, lines 10-27].

Segal fails to specifically disclose sending a message from the service center to the selected destination in response to the alert received at the service center . However, Segal does disclose the alerting signals from the mobile vehicle (108) to the dispatch center (102) for informing or determining the status of the vehicle in transit such as the vehicle has arrived or departed from a planned or unplanned stop [col.4, lines 57-62 and col.10, lines 10-27].

Furthermore, Jones discloses an advance notification system (10) could send an alert message such as " the bus will be arrive / late in five minutes " from a base station (14) to the designated location such as student homes / passenger location (36) in response to the signal from a mobile unit / pick up vehicle / bus (12) by a wireless communication which is used for communications

Art Unit: 2632

and tracking systems that track the location , movement and destination of vehicles or individuals [figs.1,4 col.3, lines 1-34 , col.10, lines 15-24 and abstract]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Segal as taught by Jones for notifying or alerting the customer the time for goods delivery or pickup at any desired location .

Regarding claims 15 & 22, Segal discloses the alert generating method comprising sending a data signal from the mobile unit (108) to a service center (102) through a wireless communication G.P.S. system (106) when monitoring of the position of the position of mobile unit indicates the mobile units satisfies the conditions for the alert [col.10, lines 10-27].

Segal fails to disclose the alert from the service center to the designated location in response to the signal from the mobile unit. However, Jones discloses an advance notification system (10) could send an alert message such as “ the bus will be arrive / late in five minutes “ from a base station (14) to the designated location such as student homes / passenger location (36) in response to the signal from a mobile unit / pick up vehicle / bus (12) by a wireless communication which is used for communications and tracking systems that track the location , movement and destination of vehicles or individuals [figs.1,4 col.3, lines 1-34 , col.10, lines 15-24 and abstract]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of Segal as taught by Jones for notifying or alerting the customer the time for goods delivery or pickup at any desired location .

Art Unit: 2632

3. Claims 16-17 & 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (U.S. 6,124,810) in view of Ross (U.S. 5,444,444).

Regarding claims 16-17, Segal discloses the mobile unit comprising:

- a location system (212) / G.P.S. system (106) [figs.1-2, col.4, lines 1-12 and col.5, lines 52-65];
- a wireless device (200,202,206) is installed in a vehicle (108) linking with a service center (102) over a wireless network (106) [figs.1-2, col.4, lines 1-12 and col.5, lines 23-39];
- a control circuit (200,202,206) including a user interface (214) [fig.2, col.5, lines 22-51 and col.14, lines 53-64];
- a control circuit (200,202,206) is installed in the vehicle (108) receives a destination list / “load assignment” from the services center (102) [figs.1-2, col.3, line 65 to col.4, line 12 and lines 24-62];
- the control circuit (200,202,206) determines a current destination from the destination list, automatically activates the location system to determine a current location of the mobile unit, determines whether the mobile unit has crossed a threshold relating to the current destination, and activate the wireless device to send an alert signal if the mobile unit has crossed the threshold [fig.2, col.4, lines 57-62 and col.10, lines 1-17].

Segal fails to specifically mention the user interface allows a user / operator to edit the destination list received from the control circuit. However, Segal does teach the vehicle operator

Art Unit: 2632

may delete any reference to the erroneous departure determination in memory (204) by I/O device / interface (214) [fig.2, col.14, lines 53-64] . Furthermore, Ross discloses a control circuit (10) including a user interface / keyboard (12) which allows a user to edit the destination list received can be utilized in a mobile vehicle or carrier is equipped with a satellite receiver, a controller and a communicator. The controller compares the current location of the vehicle to the location of the party receiving the delivery / pickup [figs.2-3, col.5, lines 33-45]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art was made to employ the system of Segal as taught by Ross for allowing a vehicle operator a capability to adjust the delivery schedule .

Regarding claim 19, Segal discloses the mobile unit wherein the wireless device is an attached data-capable cellular telephone [col.3, lines 55-64].

Regarding claims 20-21, Segal discloses the mobile unit wherein the control circuit determines / calculates the current location of the mobile unit [fig.3, col.6, lines 14-33 and col.8, lines 8-19 and abstract].

Art Unit: 2632

4. Claims 6-7, 18 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (U.S. 6,124,810) in view of Jones (U.S. 5,668,543) Further in view of Fan et al. (U.S. 5,959,577).

Regarding claims 6-7, Both Segal / Jones do not specifically disclose the alerting signal wherein providing that identifies the conditions for the alert, comprises downloading the information / destination list to a web site corresponding to the service center. However, Fan provides the concept of using the wireless network (27) such as the web site Internet can be downloaded to the vehicle location service (3) or can be loaded directly from software storage media (32) for locating and traveling information includes a map database search system and a G.P.S. wireless communication system (8) [fig.1, col.5, lines 53-61 col.6, lines 34-61]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use Fan's technique in Segal / Jones invention for providing accurate delivery information to the mobile unit that track location, movement and destination of vehicle or individual .

Regarding claim 18, Fan discloses a wireless device is a wireless modem (146) [fig.5, col.10, lines 6-8].

Regarding claim 23, Please see claims 6-7 .

Art Unit: 2632

Response to Argument

5. Applicant's argument is filed on July 16, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's Arguments:

- A) The applicant states that the Segal / Mowery references fail to disclose the central station sending a message to a designated location in response to an alert signal from a mobile unit in claim 1 .
- B) The applicant defines the new amended independent claims 14 & 16 is overcome prior art rejection .

Response to the arguments:

- A/B) Applicant's arguments with respecting to claims 1 ,14 & 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection . Please refer to claims 1 , 14 & 16 above .

Art Unit: 2632

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass, can be reached on (703)305-4717. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Examiner: Hung T. Nguyen

Date: July 31, 2002

JEFFERY HOFSSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600